UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,490	04/22/2004	Yu Jen Chen	24061.104 / TSMC2003-0457	6912

42717 7590 07/23/2009

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
IP Section
2323 Victory Avenue
Suite 700
Dallas, TX 75219

EXAMINER	
LONG, FONYA M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3689	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/829,490	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FONYA LONG	3689	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-17 and 19-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13-17 and 19-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is a Final Office Action rejection on the merits in response to communications received on April 02, 2009. Claims 1, 11, 19, 20, 23-27, and 32 have been amended. Claims 12 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19-32 are currently pending and have been addressed below.

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments to the claims are sufficient to overcome the claim objection and 112 2nd rejections set forth in the previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19, the claim limitations recite "interfaces" and "modules" which are considered software. Software does not fall within at least one of the four statutory categories (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter).

Examiner asserts although Claim 1 recites the user interface operable to use a display monitor to provide a search result, the claim fails to positively claim the display monitor as being comprised with the system claimed.

As per Claims 20-32, as clarified in Bilski, the test for a method claim is whether the claimed method is (1) tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transforms a particular article to a different state or thing.

There are two corollaries to the machine-or-transformation test. First, a mere field-of-use limitation is generally insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent-eligible. This means the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim's scope to pass the test. Second, insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable principle into a patentable process. This means reciting a specific machine or a particular transformation of a specific article in an insignificant step, such as data gathering or outputting, is not sufficient to pass the test.

As per Claims 20-32, the claims recite the use of a display monitor. Examiner asserts the use of a display monitor is considered to be an insignificant extra-solution activity. The display monitor is only used to display a search result (i.e. data outputting).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8, 12-15, and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oppedahl et al. (6,789,092) in view of Yoshida et al. (6,212,518).

As per Claim 1, Oppedahl et al. discloses a system comprising:

an extraction module, responsive to the user interface, configured to search and extract information of a customer who has used a design technical documents database, wherein the design technical documents database includes information related to the technology process (Col. 3, Lines 11-25, via parsing software that extracts information from documents such as filing data, the examining group and the recent status); and

an estimate module configured to analyze the information of the customer and evaluate for the impact to the customer by the revision of the technology process (Col. 3, Lines 11-25, discloses the system analyzing information by comparing the received information with corresponding information in the first file and determines (i.e. evaluates) if there is any difference between the received information of interest, if so, notification is sent to predetermined recipients).

However, Oppedahl et al. fails to explicitly disclose a user interface.

Yoshida et al. discloses a system and method for retrieval of data from databases with the concept of a user interface configured to accept a predefined search scope and a predefined search scheme, wherein the user interface is operable to provide a search result to a user as a visual depiction of the search result using a display monitor (Col. 6, Lines 24-28, discloses an user interface which accepts a search request from a searcher for information and displays a search result to the information searcher).

Therefore, from the teaching of Yoshida et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the status monitoring system of Oppedahl et al. to include an user interface as taught by Yoshida et al. in order to provide an efficient means to obtain relevant information stored in a system.

As per Claim 2, Oppedahl et al. discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 1, above. However, Oppedahl et al. fails to explicitly disclose a predefined search scope.

Yoshida et al. discloses a system and method for retrieval of data from databases with the concept of a predefined search scope (Col. 7, Line 26-Col. 8, Line 63, discloses having predefined search categories (i.e. search scope)).

Therefore, from the teaching of Yoshida et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the status monitoring system of Oppedahl et al. to include a predefined search scope as taught by Yoshida et al. in order to provide an efficient means to obtain relevant information stored in a system.

Examiner asserts that the predefined search scope including a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region is considered non-functional descriptive material. The search scope being a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region does not change the function of performing the search using a predefined search scope. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully

capable of performing a search using a predefined search scope including a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region.

As per Claim 3, Oppedahl et al. discloses a predefined search scheme (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses a client performing a search for records matching a predetermined criterion such as the customer number (i.e. predefined search scheme)).

Examiner asserts that the predefined search scheme including document title, document number, vendor, maker, and end customer is considered non-functional descriptive material. The search scheme being document title, document number, vendor, maker, and end customer does not change the function of performing the search using a predefined search scheme. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of performing a search using a predefined search scheme including document title, document number, vendor, maker, and end customer.

As per Claim 4, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 3, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the vendor comprising one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor.

Examiner asserts that the vendor comprising one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor is considered non-functional descriptive material. The vendor being one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor does not change the function of performing a search using a

predefined search scheme. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of having a vendor be one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor.

As per Claim 5, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 3, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the maker comprising one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility.

Examiner asserts that the maker comprising one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility is considered non-functional descriptive material. The maker being one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility does not change the function of performing a search using a predefined search scheme. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of having a maker be one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility.

As per Claims 6-8, Oppedahl et al. discloses a database comprising documents (Col. 2, Lines 48-56, discloses a database comprising a multiplicity of records). However, Oppedahl et al. fails to explicitly disclose documents being at least a process document, and at least a technical file.

Examiner asserts that the documents being at least a process document, and at least a technical file is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of

documents being stored in a database does not change the function of the claimed invention. Examiner asserts the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of a utilizing process documents and technical files.

As per Claim 13, Oppedahl et al. discloses the extraction module searching relevant documents according to the predefined search scheme (Col. 3, Lines 11-25, discloses the parsing software parsing (i.e. searching) records according to a predefined search scheme such as filing data, examining group, or examiner's name).

As per Claim 14, Oppedahl et al. discloses the extraction module performing a search (Col. 3, Lines 11-25, discloses the parsing software parsing (i.e. searching) records).

Examiner asserts the information in which the extraction module is searching for is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of information being searched for does not change the search function the claimed invention. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable is fully capable of performing a search for customers who have downloaded the relevant documents during the predefined search scope.

As per Claim 15, Oppedahl et al. discloses the extraction module extracting information (Col. 3, Lines 11-25, via parsing software that extracts information from documents).

Examiner asserts the information in which the extraction module is extracting is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of information being extracted does not change the extraction function of the claimed invention. Examiner asserts that

the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of extracting information of the customer through download history relevant documents.

As per Claim 20, Oppedahl et al. discloses providing a search scheme (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses a customer number (i.e. search scheme)) to search through a plurality of records);

searching, according to the search scheme, a microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses searching the PAIR server for records corresponding to the customer number); and

providing a result of the search as a visual depiction of the search result using a display monitor (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses providing search results via providing the client with all record identifiers matching the predetermined criterion).

However, Oppedahl fails to explicitly disclose a search scope.

Yoshida et al. discloses a method and a system for retrieval of data from databases with the concept of providing a search scope (Col. 7, Line 26-Col. 8, Line 63, discloses having predefined search categories (i.e. search scope)).

Therefore, from the teaching of Yoshida et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the status monitoring system of Oppedahl et al. to include a search scope as taught by Yoshida et al. in order to provide an efficient means to obtain relevant information stored in a system.

Examiner asserts the type of information and the type of database being searched is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of information and

type of database does not change the search function of the claimed invention. Examiner asserts the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of search through design technical documents that includes information related to a technology process to determine a customer impacted by the revision.

As per Claim 21, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the search scope including one of a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region of a customer.

Examiner asserts that the predefined search scope including a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region is considered non-functional descriptive material. The search scope being a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region does not change the function of performing the search using a predefined search scope. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of performing a search using a predefined search scope including a period of time, a type of technology, and a physical region.

As per Claim 22, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 21, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the search scheme including one of a document title, a document number, a vendor, a maker, and an end customer.

Examiner asserts that the predefined search scheme including document title, document number, vendor, maker, and end customer is considered non-functional descriptive material. The search scheme being document title, document number,

vendor, maker, and end customer does not change the function of performing the search using a predefined search scheme. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of performing a search using a predefined search scheme including document title, document number, vendor, maker, and end customer.

As per Claim 23, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the type of technology.

Examiner asserts that the type of technology including 0.25 μm and above, 0.25 μm to 0.15 μm, 0.15 μm to 0.09 μm, and below 0.09 μm is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of technology does not change the function of performing a search. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of performing a search with information related to the technology process, wherein the technology includes 0.25 μm and above, 0.25 μm to 0.15 μm, 0.15 μm to 0.09 μm, and below 0.09 μm.

As per Claim 24, Oppedahl et al. discloses performing a search for a period of time (Col. 2, Line 65-Col. 3, Line 3, discloses a search for updates being performed daily, weekly, or monthly).

Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the search be performed quarterly (i.e. 3 months), bi-yearly (i.e. 6 months), or yearly (i.e. 12 months).

As per Claim 25, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the type of vendor.

Examiner asserts that the vendor comprising one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor is considered non-functional descriptive material. The vendor being one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor does not change the function of performing a search using a predefined search scheme. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of having a vendor be one of electronic design automation (EDA) vendor, a chip service company, a library, and an intellectual property (IP) vendor.

As per Claim 26, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose a type of maker.

Examiner asserts that the maker comprising one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility is considered non-functional descriptive material. The maker being one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility does not change the function of performing a search using a predefined search scheme. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of having a maker be

one of a photomask maker, a wafer manufacturer, a testing facility, and a packaging facility.

As per Claim 27, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the design technical documents database comprising one of design rule check database, layout versus schematic database, and RC extraction database.

Examiner asserts that the type of database and the type of data being stored on the database is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of database and the type of data being stored on the database does not change the claimed function of performing a search. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination is fully capable of utilizing a design database comprising one of design rule check database, layout versus schematic database, and RC extraction database.

6. Claims 9-11 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oppedahl et al. (6,789,092) in view of Yoshida et al. (6,212,518) and in further view of Kuo (US 2005/0021165).

As per Claim 9, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 1, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly discloses the system comprising a virtual fab.

Kuo discloses an inter-fab mask process management system with the concept of a virtual fab that is a network entity (Abstract; Fig. 1, 2, and 3; [00919], discloses a virtual fab which is a plurality of entities, each entity associated with an internal process to a semiconductor fab or an external process via a network).

Therefore, from the teaching of Kuo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include a virtual fab as taught by Kuo in order to aid in managing documentation for a semiconductor manufacturing environment.

As per Claim 10, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 9, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the virtual fab being connected to at least one of a customer, a vendor, a manufacturer, and a design group.

Kuo discloses an inter-fab mask process management system with the concept of a virtual fab being connected to at least one of a customer, a vendor, a manufacturer, and a design group (Abstract; Fig. 1, 2, and 3; [0022], discloses the virtual fab being connected to a customer).

Therefore, from the teaching of Kuo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include a virtual fab as taught by Kuo in order to aid in managing documentation for a semiconductor manufacturing environment.

As per Claim 11, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 9, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose the virtual fab comprising a plurality of databases.

Kuo discloses an inter-fab mask process management system with the concept of a virtual fab comprising a plurality of databases ([0019-0021] discloses the virtual fab

having a plurality of entities wherein each entity comprises a memory unit which may include remote storage locations).

Therefore, from the teaching of Kuo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include the virtual fab comprising a plurality of databases as taught by Kuo in order to aid in managing documentation for a semiconductor manufacturing environment.

Examiner asserts that the database comprising design technical documents is considered non-functional descriptive materials. The type of data being stored in a database does not change the function of the claimed invention. Examiner asserts that the Oppedahl et al., Yoshida et al., and Kuo combination is fully capable of having a database contain design technical documents.

As per Claims 28 and 29, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to disclose a virtual fab that is a network entity.

Kuo discloses an inter-fab mask process management system with the concept of a virtual fab that is a network entity (Abstract; Fig. 1, 2, and 3; [00919], discloses a virtual fab which is a plurality of entities, each entity associated with an internal process to a semiconductor fab or an external process via a network).

Therefore, from the teaching of Kuo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al.

and Yoshida et al. combination to include a virtual fab as taught by Kuo in order to aid in managing documentation for a semiconductor manufacturing environment.

As per Claim 30, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 29, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose a virtual fab being connected to at least a customer, a vendor, a manufacturer, and a design lab.

Kuo discloses an inter-fab mask process management system with the concept of a virtual fab being connected to at least one of a customer, a vendor, a manufacturer, and a design group (Abstract; Fig. 1, 2, and 3; [0022], discloses the virtual fab being connected to a customer).

Therefore, from the teaching of Kuo, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include a virtual fab as taught by Kuo in order to aid in managing documentation for a semiconductor manufacturing environment.

7. Claims 16, 17, 19, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oppedahl et al. (6,789,092) in view of Yoshida et al. (6,212,518) and in further view of Mir (6,938,081).

As per Claim 16, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 1, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose providing a list of customers.

Mir discloses a system and method for managing changes to a process with the concept of providing a list of customers who are impacted by the revision of the

technology process (Col. 12, Lines 23-30, via notification section provides a listing a impacted customers that should be notified of the change).

Therefore, from the teaching of Mir, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include providing a list of customers as taught by Mir in order to aid in gracefully carrying out a change by providing awareness to those impacted by the change.

As per Claim 17, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 16, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly discloses providing a list of customers.

Mir discloses a system and method for managing changes to a process with the concept of providing a list of customer who are impacted by the revision of the technology process according to a quantitative criteria (Col. 12, Lines 23-30, via notification section provides a listing of impacted customers that should be notified of the change).

Therefore, from the teaching of Mir, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include providing a list of customers as taught by Mir in order to aid in gracefully carrying out a change by providing awareness to those impacted by the change.

As per Claim 19, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 1, above. However, the combination fails to

explicitly disclose providing a suggestion for a communication with relevant customers, vendors, and makers for the revision.

Mir discloses a system and method for managing changes to a process with the concept of providing a suggestion for a communication with relevant customers, vendors, and makers for the revision of the technology process (Abstract, discloses providing rules (i.e. suggestions) about how the affected entities should be notified of the change).

Therefore, from the teaching of Mir, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include providing a suggestion for a communication with relevant customers, vendors, and makers for the revision as taught by Mir in order to aid in gracefully carrying out a change by providing awareness to those impacted by the change.

As per Claim 31, the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination discloses the claimed invention as applied to Claim 20, above. However, the combination fails to explicitly disclose specifying a change of process and verifying validity of the change of process.

Mir discloses a system and method for managing changes to a process with the concept of specifying a change of process wherein the change of process is associated with a technical document (Col. 7, Lines 1-20, discloses specifying a change of process via opening a change ticket and writing the accompanying change plan which is includes information on the impact of the change, or who is involved in the change); and

verifying validity of the change of process according to a set of predefined rules (Col. 4, Lines 22-67, discloses approving or disapproving (i.e. verifying validity) of the change plan that comprises a set of instructions on how to carry out the change).

Therefore, from the teaching of Mir, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include specifying a change of process and verifying validity of the change of process as taught by Mir in order to aid in gracefully carrying out a change by providing awareness to those impacted by the change.

As per Claim 32, Oppedahl et al. discloses providing a search scheme (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses a customer number (i.e. search scheme)) to search through a plurality of records); and

searching, according to the search scheme, a plurality of microelectronics fabrication design databases (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses searching the PAIR server for records corresponding to the customer number); and

providing a result of the search as a visual depiction of the search result using a display monitor (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses providing search results via providing the client with all record identifiers matching the predetermined criterion).

However, Oppedahl fails to explicitly disclose a search scope; specifying a change of process; and verifying validity of the change of process.

Yoshida et al. discloses a system and method for retrieval of data from databases with the concept of providing a search scope (Col. 7, Line 26-Col. 8, Line 63, discloses having predefined search categories (i.e. search scope)).

Therefore, from the teaching of Yoshida et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the status monitoring system of Oppedahl et al. to include a search scope as taught by Yoshida et al. in order to provide an efficient means to obtain relevant information stored in a system.

Mir discloses a system and method for managing changes to a process with the concept of specifying a change of process wherein the change of process is associated with a technical document (Col. 7, Lines 1-20, discloses specifying a change of process via opening a change ticket and writing the accompanying change plan which is includes information on the impact of the change, or who is involved in the change); and verifying validity of the change of process according to a set of predefined rules (Col. 4, Lines 22-67, discloses approving or disapproving (i.e. verifying validity) of the change plan that comprises a set of instructions on how to carry out the change).

Therefore, from the teaching of Mir, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination to include specifying a change of process and verifying validity of the change of process as taught by Mir in order to aid in gracefully carrying out a change by providing awareness to those impacted by the change.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed April 02, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

101 Rejections

As per Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19-32, Applicant argues that the claims contain statutory subject matter based on the amended claims. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As per Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19, Examiner asserts although Claim 1 recites the user interface operable to use a display monitor to provide a search result, the claim fails to positively claim the display monitor as being comprised with the system claimed. Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19 positively recite an interface and modules which are considered software and do not fall within the four statutory categories. As per Claims 20-32, the claims recite the use of a display monitor. Examiner asserts the use of a display monitor is considered to be an insignificant extra-solution activity. The display monitor is only used to display a search result (i.e. data outputting) and therefore does not satisfy the 101 requirements under Bilski.

103 Rejections

As per Claim 1, Applicant argues that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination fails to disclose searching a "microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts Oppedahl et al. discloses searching a database (Col. 3, Lines 11-25, via parsing software that extracts information from documents such as filing data, the examining group and the recent status). Examiner asserts that the fact that the database is identified as a "microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database" is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of database and documents being searched

does not change the function of the claimed invention. Neither the applicant nor the written description provides any implication as to how performing a search on a "microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database" would be performed differently from searching any other form of databases comprising documents.

As per Claims 20 and 32, Applicant argues that the Oppedahl et al. and Yoshida et al. combination fails to discloses "searching, according to the search scope and the search scheme, a microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database that includes information related to the technology process to determine a customer impacted by the revision." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts Oppedahl et al. discloses searching, according to the search scheme, a microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database (Col. 4, Lines 19-31, discloses searching the PAIR server for records corresponding to the customer number). Yoshida et al. discloses providing a search scope (Col. 7, Line 26-Col. 8, Line 63, discloses having predefined search categories (i.e. search scope)). Examiner asserts that the fact that the database is identified as a "microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database" is considered non-functional descriptive material. The type of database and documents being searched does not change the function of the claimed invention. Neither the applicant nor the written description provides any implication as to how performing a search on a "microelectronics fabrication design technical documents database" would be performed differently from searching any other form of databases comprising documents.

As per Claims 2-11, 13-17, 19, and 21-31, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FONYA LONG whose telephone number is (571)270-5096. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. 7:30am-6pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on (571) 272-6805. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/F. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 3689

/Dennis Ruhl/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689